

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. schedule	Phone No. (Partial) Personal (Partial). Secret Service (Partial) (5 pages)	08/12/2000	P6/b(6), b(7)(E)
002. draft	Hillary Rodham Clinton Remarks to the Democratic National Convention Los Angeles, California. (11 pages)	08/14/2000	P5
003. schedule	Phone No. (Partial) Secret Service (Partial) (5 pages)	08/13/2000	P6/b(6), b(7)(E)
004. schedule	Phone No. (Partial) Secret Service (Partial) (7 pages)	08/13/2000	P6/b(6), b(7)(E)
005. schedule	Phone No. (Partial) (1 page)	08/14/2000	P6/b(6)
006. note	[Notes concerning White House Recipe book and First Lady] (3 pages)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
007. email	Kiely, Kathy to Lissa Muscatine. (Partial) (1 page)	08/08/2000	P6/b(6)
008. list	Telephone contact list. (Partial) (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
First Lady's Press Office (Lissa Muscatine)
OA/Box Number: 21396

FOLDER TITLE:

Convention 2000 [1]

Adam Bergfeld

2006-0226-F

ab643

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Draft 13 – 11 am Saturday

**HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS TO
THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
AUGUST 14, 2000**

Thank you so much for your warm welcome. Thank you for your dedication to the ideals of the Democratic party and for helping to put those ideals to work for our country. Thank you for supporting my husband, who has worked so hard to prepare Americans and lead America into the 21st Century.

We are a better, stronger country than we were in 1992.

When Bill and Al and Tipper and I got onto ^{that} ~~the~~ bus for the ~~first time~~ outside Madison Square Garden ~~after the convention that~~ ^{eight years ago} ~~nominated them in New York~~, we began a journey that took us through America's heartland. Along the way we saw faces of hope – fathers out of work, mothers trapped on welfare, children with unmet medical needs.

I remember especially the sign a group of children held, which said: "Please stop. If you give us eight minutes, we'll give you eight years."

we did listen
Well, we did stop and what an eight years it's been!

Now
And we can continue this prosperity and progress by electing Al Gore and Joe Lieberman the next President and Vice President of the United States of America!

Even if he was POTUS, g'd
~~I have known and admired Al for many reasons over the~~
years: his ~~successful work~~ *leadership* in the Senate; his understanding of the future; ~~the family conferences he and Tipper host that~~ *his work w/* promote responsible parenting; his pioneering efforts to fight toxic waste and pollution ~~to protect~~ *that threaten* the health of our children.

~~And~~ Since 1992 I've been ~~privileged to work with him and to~~ *ed.* watch him as my husband's trusted partner in the White House. They made the hard decisions to renew both our economy and our national spirit. To wage peace and, when necessary, war. To advance democracy and freedom around the world.

I can't wait to watch Al Gore take the oath of office on the steps of the U.S. Capitol on January 20th.

And standing next to him will be his incredible wife Tipper. I'm blessed to count her as a dear friend – someone who *inspires*

Leading America

all of us by her caring for the homeless and her ~~fight to remove the~~
~~stigma around mental illness so that~~ mental health issues are
treated as seriously as any other health issue. Tipper Gore will
continue to inspire us ~~and warm our hearts as~~ our next First Lady.

And, the country has seen proof of Al Gore's vision and
leadership in his choice of Joe Lieberman to be ~~his~~ ^{our next} Vice-President.

I first met Joe 30 years ago when Bill and I were law
students. We saw then what Americans are seeing now -- a person
of ~~great~~ ^{uncommon} wisdom and integrity. I especially appreciate Joe's work
to give parents more control over the programming our children
watch, and to reduce the violence in our media.

And then there is Joe's remarkable wife Hadassah, the
daughter of concentration camp survivors. [Their story tells our
children that in America, if you work hard, anything is possible.]

Al, Tipper, Joe, and Hadassah are truly the American Dream
team!

And they will continue the work started in 1992 with ~~a~~ ^{our}
promise to all Americans to put people first by restoring a simple,

yet profound, principle: When people live up to their responsibilities, we ought to live up to ours and give them the tools they need to build better lives. That's the basic bargain at the heart of the American dream.

And look how that promise has been kept. *those last 8 years* Americans have taken responsibility, Americans have created opportunity, and America is stronger than ever before.

Not only did Bill Clinton and Al Gore put people first. They put children first.

more out of
~~Fewer children are living in poverty and millions of parents have traded welfare checks for paychecks.~~

in
~~More children are getting the Head Start they need for school and after school programs for safety and learning.~~

More children getting
~~More children are protected from childhood diseases - with immunization rates the highest in history. And finally children in working families are being insured~~

More children are getting more time from their parents –
because ~~of the~~ ^{Act Law} Family and Medical Leave ~~has allowed 20 million~~

~~Americans to take time off to care for their newborns or sick~~
~~children without losing their jobs. And now let's expand it to 20~~
~~million more Americans.~~ ^{And now let's expand it}
^{to 20 million more Americans} !!!

More foster children ~~are being~~ adopted into loving,
permanent families.

Children like Dianna, who came to a White House ceremony
I held to spotlight the needs of children in foster care. Just 12 years
old, she had spent most of her life in foster care. She was so shy
that she could barely lift her eyes off the podium as she spoke of
her yearning for a home and family of her own.

~~I thought about our own daughter as~~ I asked myself: "How
can we let any child grow up in our country without a secure and
loving home?"

We set a goal to double the number of foster children adopted
and I worked with a bipartisan coalition to reform the adoption and
foster care systems. And when the President signed a new law in ^{adoption}
1997 to ~~make it easier to adopt children.~~ I thought of the first foster

child I represented back in 1970 when I was a law student. ~~Of the
abused children I used to see when I made the rounds with doctors
at the Yale-New Haven Hospital.~~

And I thought of Dianna, whom I have seen blossom into a beaming, confident young woman because caring parents opened their hearts and home to her. She finally had what every child needs – a family that puts her first.

Years ago, when I chaired the board of the Children's Defense Fund, we had a motto, and it's still our motto: Leave no child behind. [Hmm. Where have I heard that lately?].

That shouldn't just be a slogan for the other party's political convention. But a commitment that we honor by our actions every day and every year by helping even more children fulfill their God-given potential.

~~And it's a commitment I hope to honor if I'm elected to represent the people of New York in the United States Senate.~~

[[[The other party's recent rhetoric has not been matched by reality: When they fight against building schools to end over-

crowded classrooms or mandating trigger locks to end tragic shootings they are deciding to leave children behind.]]]

Because everywhere I go I see too many children facing too many challenges. Children afraid to go to school because guns and violence stalk their hallways and classrooms. Children confused by the messages of a popular culture at odds with their parents' values. Children whose coughs and colds are treated too late -- or not at all -- because their working parents still can't afford health insurance. Children struggling to learn in overcrowded classrooms and crumbling schools.

Don't let anyone tell you that this election doesn't matter.
In November you get
The stakes are biggest for our ~~lowest~~ citizens.

It's our responsibility

It's up to us to speak out and vote for those without a voice so we can build the future our children deserve.

Every

~~All our children deserve modern public schools, high standards, and qualified new teachers.~~ And Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will make it happen.
Pro-education cuts for college tuition

All our children deserve better opportunities to go to college
– new student loans and a tax cut for college tuition. Al Gore and
Joe Lieberman will make it happen.

protected from a culture of violence
All our children deserve homes, schools and neighborhoods
~~safe from violence~~ *with* and they deserve common sense gun safety
laws so every handgun owner has a background check and a safety
course. Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will make it happen.

tool
All our children deserve to be protected by their parents and
society from the violence that is on TV, the Internet, and video
games. Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will make it happen.

All our children deserve clean air and water, unspoiled open
space and wilderness to cherish. Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will
make it happen.

Every
All our children deserve a nation that is free of ~~the~~ debt ~~they~~
~~did not amass~~ *to grow up* We must use our surplus to pay down the national
debt, secure Social Security and modernize Medicare. Al Gore and
Joe Lieberman will make it happen.

And yes, all children and every family ^{has} ~~deserve~~ access to quality, affordable healthcare.

You may remember I had a few ideas on this topic. I've learned a few lessons since then. But we haven't given up on the goal. That's why we kept working step by step to create the Children's Health Insurance Program to cover 5 million children, to make sure workers can keep their insurance between jobs and to expand mammogram coverage in Medicare.

We won't stop working until we have a real Patient's Bill of Rights, a universal prescription drug benefit for Medicare and affordable long-term care. ~~So let's not stop until every child and every family has access to quality, affordable health care.~~ ^{and} Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will ~~make it happen~~ ^{fight for that} ~~child~~ ^{child}.

So while we parents have the most important job to do to raise America's children, all of us have to renew the basic bargain of the American Dream for our next generation.

What does it take?

It takes leadership that puts children first -- in deeds and not just words.

It takes Al Gore and Joe Lieberman.

It takes all Americans -- teachers, workers, business owners, community leaders, people of faith.

And yes, it takes a village.

The other day Bill and I were looking at pictures of our daughter from when this journey began eight years ago. We are humbled that our 12 year old girl has grown into the strong, resilient woman she is today. And we want to thank the American people for giving her the space to grow. And Chelsea -- thank you for making your father and me the proudest parents in America.

Bill and I are closing one chapter of our lives -- and soon, we'll be starting a new one. And it will be up to the people of New York to decide whether I'll have the privilege of serving them in the United States Senate.

But no matter where I go after this, I will always be profoundly grateful to all of you and to the American people for the last eight years.

Really, the most important thing that I can say tonight is: thank you.

Thank you for giving me the most extraordinary opportunity to work on the issues that matter most to children and families. Thank you for your faith and support in good times – and in bad. And thank you for the honor and privilege of a lifetime.

Good night, and God Bless you all.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. draft	Remarks by the President at Annual Meeting of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America Hyatt Regency Hotel Chicago, Illinois. (8 pages)	08/02/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Speech Writing
Josh Gottheimer
OA/Box Number: 18993

FOLDER TITLE:

Democratic Convention 2000 [2]

Adam Bergfeld
2006-0226-F
ab868

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

8-2-00

Terry
I think beginning at
the bottom of p. 6 is the best
version of the ending the end

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA
HYATT REGENCY HOTEL
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JULY 30, 2000

TR

President Middleton, after your remarks, if I had any sense, I wouldn't say anything. I'd just sit down. I want to thank you, and thank you, Fred Baron, my longtime friend, for inviting me here. There are so many of you here that I've had the honor of working with over the last seven and a half years, sometimes even longer.

I am proud of the fact that this organization and its members have been standing up for the rights of wronged and injured Americans since 1946. Now, that was before we had the EPA or the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or the Clean Air or Clean Water Act. It's important to remember that those protections and many others were written into the law after years of lawsuits that highlighted the problems we faced and wrongs that were done.

What is the lesson of all this? That the public interest requires both reasonable access to the courts and responsible action by Congress. We have done what we could in the last seven and a half years to move toward accountability in the court on three issues -- tobacco, guns and patients' rights -- and to keep the American people's availability of a civil justice system alive and well.

But only Congress can pass laws that will hold tobacco companies, gun manufacturers and health plans accountable for the choices they make and the consequences of those choices. So I hope Congress will also help us because I know that everybody in this room agrees that an ounce of prevention in law is worth a million dollars in curative lawsuits.

We've worked for seven and a half years now to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco, thanks in large measure to the leadership of Vice President Gore and Senator Dick Durbin from Illinois, who has been with me through much of this day. Now the Justice Department is leading our efforts to get tobacco companies to repay the government for the costs of tobacco-related illnesses. But the Supreme Court has told Congress the ball is in its court; it must act to give FDA tobacco regulations the force of law.

I have asked Congress to do that and to support, not undermine, the Justice Department's lawsuit. I hope that the Congress, and especially the Republicans in Congress, will be able to break an addiction to the tobacco lobby and meet their responsibilities to the American people.

I am grateful beyond measure that the crime rate has dropped in this country to a 25-year low, that gun crime is down by 35 percent over the last seven and a half years, but I don't think anybody in America believes that we're safe enough as a nation or that there's not more we can do -- more we can do to put more police on the street in dangerous neighborhoods; more we can do to keep our kids off the streets in after-school programs, summer school programs, summer job programs, mentoring programs; and more we can do to keep guns out the hands of criminals and children.

I've asked Congress to give us common sense gun legislation measures to close the gun show loophole and the Brady background check law, to require child safety locks for all handguns, to ban the importation of large-capacity ammunition clips. I've also endorsed requiring people who buy handguns to get a photo ID license, just like a driver's license, showing that you passed the background check and you know how to use the gun safely. So far, no action in Congress, even on the first three measures.

We reached a historic agreement with the Smith & Wesson Company to build safer guns, a truly astonishing step forward and a brave thing for them to do. But the rest of the industry and the gun lobby are trying to destroy them for doing it, and they're working hard to make sure that they can't keep up their end of the bargain.

I hope all of them will think again about where their responsibility really lies. After all, who honestly has an interest in selling a gun to somebody with a criminal record? Who has an interest in selling a gun that's not protected when it will be put in some place where a little child can find it and cause an accidental death? I hope that we'll see a change in attitude there, too, and I hope the American people will have the opportunity to make their position on these matters crystal clear in November.

Wherever I go, I heard heartbreaking stories about patients turned away from the closest emergency room. The other day I was in Missouri with the Governor of that state who signed one of the

strongest patients' bill of rights in the country at the state level, and they still have about a million people in their state who aren't covered because of the way the federal law works.

And there was this emergency room nurse speaking with us there -- or it was an emergency nurse who had been also an emergency medical technician. It was a man who must have weighed 225 pounds and looked like he could bench-press me on a cold day. And this big old burly guy got up and practically started crying, talking about someone that he had just seen die because they were not permitted to go to the nearest emergency room.

I had the guy the other day tell me a story about getting hit by a car and saying that this health plan wouldn't approve his going to the nearest emergency room because he hadn't called for permission first. He said, "I was unconscious at the time. I didn't know how to make the phone call."

Now, all of you know these are -- if you practice in this area, you know that this is not just some set of isolated anecdotes. And I believe that health care decisions should be made by health care professionals. I believe people ought to be able to go to the nearest emergency room. I don't believe that people should be forced to change physicians in the middle of treatment, whether it's chemotherapy or having a baby. And I think if people get hurt they ought to have the right to seek redress in our courts. That's what the patients' bill of rights does.

Let me say, as I have said over and over again, this is not a partisan issue. Survey after survey after survey has shown that more than 70 percent of the American people, whether they identify themselves as Republicans or Democrats or independents, support the passage of a strong, enforceable patients' bill of rights. This is not a partisan issue; this is a special interest issue.

We passed with a bipartisan vote -- a good number of Republicans voted for a bill called the Norwood-Dingel bill in the House of Representatives, and I am profoundly grateful to everyone who voted for that bill in both parties. And then, in the Senate we came within a vote, really, of passing it. We lost it 51-49, and if it had gotten 50 votes, then the Vice President could have broken the tie. And as he never tires of saying, whenever he votes, we win. He always kids me that he has a much better record of legislative success than I do. He never loses. Whenever he votes, we win.

And so I have some hope that we can do this. But this is a huge deal and it goes to the core of what kind of people we are. And I feel that I have the right to speak passionately about this because I actually have always supported managed care in general. Let me remind you of something.

Your president was telling you about what things were like in 1992. In 1992 and for several years before that, health care costs had been going up at three times the rate of inflation. We were then and are now spending about 4 percent more of our national income, which is a huge chunk of change, on health care than any other country in the world; about 6 percent more than virtually all other advanced countries -- Canada is 4 percent lower than we are -- and yet we were the only one that basically had tens of millions of people without any health insurance.

So it was obvious that we needed to manage the system better because a lot of the money was just getting away from us. Having said that, you can not allow the management of the system to overcome its fundamental purpose, which is to help people get healthy, or stay healthy, or deal with them when they're injured or sick.

Let me just emphasize, I've talked to a lot of people about this. I've talked to a lot of nurses and doctors and people who work in insurance companies. I've talked to the representatives of the 14 HMOs that endorsed our patients' bill of rights -- because they desperately want to do this, but they don't want to be disadvantaged by having all their competitors able to run off and leave them and follow a different set of rules.

And the fundamental problem is in a lot of these cases, particularly on specialist care, is that you have to go through three levels before a final decision is made, and the people at the first two levels know they'll never get in trouble for saying no. And whenever you have a system where someone never gets in trouble for saying no and not get in trouble for saying yes, even if yes is plainly the right answer, then there needs to be some way people can get redress if they get hurt in a system like that. That's the issue. So a right without a remedy is just a suggestion. And I think we all know that.

So we've got to keep working. We might get there this year. We're chipping away at it. If we turn one, or maybe two to be safe in the Senate, we'll be home.

Now, let me just say one other thing. I couldn't appear before an audience of lawyers without mentioning what I consider

to be another threat to our system of equal justice under law, and that is the Senate slowdown in consideration and confirmation of my nominees to our courts, especially to our appellate courts.

The judges I have appointed have the highest ratings the American Bar Association has given out in 40 years. They are also the most diverse group ever appointed to the Federal bench. We've shattered the myth that diversity and quality don't go hand in hand.

I also have bent over backwards not to appoint people just because I thought that every single ruling would agree with me. And I've probably appointed a person or two that some of you didn't like. But I've tried to find mainstream judges that would follow the Constitution and be faithful to the interest of individual litigants who have rights under the law and Constitution of the United States, and to be fair and balanced to both sides. That's what I have tried to do.

Now, it is, therefore -- Because of that record, and there have been lots of legal analyses by respected, totally nonpolitical writers saying how I have changed the thrust of the court appointments, especially appellate court appointments, and my appointees are far less ideological, one way or the other, than those of the last two administrations. Now, a blue ribbon panel, however, recently found that during the 105th Congress, the nominations of women and minorities tended to take two months longer to be considered than those of white males; and though they were just as qualified, according to the ABA, they tended to be rejected twice as often. I'll give you just exhibit A. I've talked about this all over America.

I nominated a man named Enrique Moreno, a highly regarded trial lawyer from El Paso, to the 5th Circuit. The Texas state judges said he was one of the three best trial lawyers in the region. The ABA unanimously rated him well qualified. He had broad support from local law enforcement officials and from local Republicans and Democrats. Again, it was not a partisan issue. The guy came up out of El Paso, went to Harvard, made great grades, made something of himself. Everybody said he was qualified -- everybody except the two senators from Texas who said he wasn't qualified, no matter what the ABA said, no matter what the Texas state judges said, no matter what the local Republicans and Democrats said, he's not qualified. Nineteen years in practice isn't enough to qualify to make the kind of judgments they have to make. And regrettably, none of the other leading Republicans in Texas would even ask for him to have a hearing. And so he sits in limbo.

Look at the Fourth Circuit in the Southeast United States. The largest percentage of African Americans in any federal circuit are in the Fourth Circuit; 25 percent of the judgeships are vacant. I've been trying for seven years to put an African American on that court because there has never been one in the district with the largest number of African Americans in the entire country. I think it's wrong. And they have worked so hard to keep me from doing it that they're willing to tolerate a 25 percent vacancy rate.

Now, keep in mind I never sent anybody up there that wasn't qualified. We now have two fine well-qualified African Americans pending for that circuit, Judge James Wynn of North Carolina and Roger Gregory of Virginia. Neither has even gotten a hearing.

The Senate has 37 nominations before it now, and 29 of those folks have never gotten a hearing. Fifteen have been nominated to fill empty seats that the U.S. courts consider judicial emergencies, places where our legal business simply isn't being done; 13 of them, including well-respected litigators like Dolly Gee (phonetic) and first-rate jurists like Lagrome Davis (phonetic) have been waiting more than a year. Judge Helene White has been waiting for three years.

Now, if we want our courts to function properly, the Senate ought to vote these folks up or down. If they don't like them, vote them down. But is the question, can they be competent, will they run a fair and effective court if there are criminal trials, will the civil cases be tried promptly and fairly, do they believe justice delayed is justice denied, or is the problem that they are not sufficiently ideological predictable?

This is a big issue and a serious precedent. We all want justice to be blind, but we know when we have diversity in our courts, just as in other aspects of our society, it sharpens our vision and makes us a stronger nation. That is a goal ATLA has always set.

Now, I was told that no President had ever addressed the full ATLA Convention before, and since you were born in the same year I was I thought I'd show up. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the kindness so many of you have shown me, the support that so many of you have given to our initiatives ^{to} defending the civil courts and defending the constitution. This is a year in which the American people will be given a chance to chart the course of the future for a long time to come. They'll elect a new President, a new Vice President, senators and members of Congress. In the course of that, if all the predictions are

true, they will also be shaping a new Supreme Court because the next President, in all probability, will make between two and four appointments to the Supreme Court. Choices will be made and those choices will have consequences.

I think it is very important that you make up your mind what you think the choices are and what the consequences will be, and that you share them with others. The last time a President, nearly as I can tell from my research, talked to any ATLA group was when President Johnson appeared before your board of directors in 1964. And so I want to tell you a little story about 1964 to emphasize why I think this year is so important to all of us as Americans.

In 1964, I graduated from high school, and I, therefore, have a very clear recollection of that year. All of us were still profoundly sad over the death of President Kennedy, but fundamentally optimistic. America was then in the full flow of what was until now the longest economic expansion in history. Vietnam had not yet blown up and no one really thought it would get as big as it did, or claim as many lives as it did, or divide the country the way it did.

~~Pythian~~ ^{had}
~~There were~~ then we had about 10 years of vigorous activism in civil rights, but most people believed, given the White House and the composition of the Congress, that the civil rights problems of this country would be solved in the Congress and in the courts, not in the streets. And nearly everybody thought the economy was on automatic and you couldn't mess it up if you tried. We took low unemployment and high growth and low inflation for granted. And I was one of those bright-eyed idealistic kids ~~that~~ ^{who} felt just that way.

Two years later we had riots in the streets. Four years later, when I graduated from Georgetown, it was nine weeks after President Johnson said he couldn't run for President again because the country was so divided over Vietnam, eight weeks after Martin Luther King was killed in Memphis, two days after Senator Kennedy was killed in Los Angeles. The next election had a different outcome -- within a few months, the previous longest economic expansion in history itself was history.

What's the point of all this? I don't know when we'll ever have a time like this again, where we have so much economic prosperity and all the social indicators from crime to welfare to teen pregnancy, you name it, they're all going in the right direction; where our country is in a position to be a force for peace and freedom and decency from the Middle East to Northern

Ireland to the Balkans to Africa and Latin America; where we have the chance to build the future of our dreams for our children and protect the fundamental essence of American citizenship and constitutional liberty, even as we build a more united community amidst all of our diversity.

And I'm old enough now to know that nothing stays the same ~~and~~ things change. ~~I~~ I say this to you more as a citizen than as a President, because I'm not a candidate this year. But I think it is profoundly important that the American people make up their mind what to do with this moment -- this magic moment in our history. And I think we will not ever forgive ourselves if we let it get away from us.

~~But~~ In 1964, ~~when LBJ came here~~, we let it get away from us. But the problems were deep and imponderable and difficult to move away from -- the problem of Vietnam and the problem of civil rights. We are not burdened ~~to the extent that time was~~ by anything of that magnitude. But we know what's coming down the pike. We know we have to deal with the retirement of the baby boomers. We know we're not giving every kid in this country a world-class education; we know that we have not done what we should do in terms of safe streets and health care; we know we're going to have to deal with the problems of climate change. We know this explosion in biotechnology that the Human Genome Project exemplifies will change things forever and require us to rethink our whole notion of health and retirement. We know that we have responsibilities to people around the world if we want Americans to do as well as they can at home.

And at the core of it all is what is our fundamental notion about what it means to be a citizen of this country -- to have rights ~~in the courts and on the streets and in our daily lives,~~ ~~yes~~, but also to have responsibilities to one another and to our country and to the future.

~~I want you all to think about that. I've done everything I knew to turn this country around, to ~~get~~ to get things going in the right direction. And now ~~the~~ the great ~~stuff~~ ~~is~~ still out there, just waiting for us to build a future of our dreams for our kids. That's all that matters -- not the politics, not the injuries, not the hurts, not the barbs, not the bragging, not the plaudits.~~ penetration
are

There's an old Italian proverb that says, after the game, the king and the pawn go back into the same box. It's well to remember. All we really have is our common humanity. But once in a great long while, we get an unbelievable opportunity to make the most of it. You've got it now, and I hope you will.

Thank you and God bless you.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Ron Klain to Albert Gore 18:23:11.00. Subject: CNN/USA Today poll (2 pages)	01/12/1999	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Tape Restoration Project (Email)
WHO ([Gore, Election])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/12/1999]

Adam Bergfeld
2006-0226-F
ab872

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

WJC LIBRARY COPY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JAN-1999 18:23:11.00

SUBJECT: CNN/USA TODAY poll

TO: Albert Gore (CN=Albert Gore/O=OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher S. Lehane (CN=Christopher S. Lehane/O=OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Monica M. Dixon (CN=Monica M. Dixon/O=OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Patricia M. Ewing (CN=Patricia M. Ewing/O=OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Chris Lehane has been given the results from their newest poll on 2000.

Here they are, as compared to

their last polling, in Oct:

Dem Primary	10/23/98	1/10/99
Gore		
41%	47%	
Gephardt		
14%	13%	
Bradley		
15%	12%	
Jackson		
11%	11%	
B. Kerrey		
4%	---	
J. Kerry		

4%

5%

[Gore - Bradley]

[+26%]

[+35%]

General Election

10/23/98

1/10/99

Gore

39%

45%

Bush

57%

47%

[Gore - Bush]

[-18%]

[

- 2%]

This will be in USA TODAY tomorrow. As for our response, I have told Chris (and will tell our outside folks) to UNDERSPIN this, and downplay its significance: "Polls go up, polls go down. The Vice President is focused on doing the business of the country -- as typified by his efforts this week to promote "smart growth," lifelong learning, economic development, and reform of our government."

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. cable	Fanmi Lavalas demands that the rich candidates support the less fortunate ones. (3 pages)	03/01/2000	P1/b(1)
002. cable	Fanmi Lavalas demands that the rich candidates support the less fortunate ones. (3 pages)	03/01/00	P1/b(1)
003. cable	***No Subject Found*** (6 pages)	03/10/2000	P1/b(1)
004. cable	Negative OMANI Reaction to President Clinton's Statement on Possible Embassy Transfer to Jerusalem. (partial) (1 page)	07/30/2000	P5
005. cable	Fox Transition Team for International Affairs Announced. (5 pages)	08/03/2000	P1/b(1)
006. cable	Lamy in Copenhagen:... (2 pages)	09/19/2000	P1/b(1)
007. cable	[Saudi Press Document] (2 pages)	09/23/2000	P1/b(1)
008. cable	Ambassador's Lunch with Zeman (4 pages)	11/27/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1999-Dec 2000 ([Gore and Campaign])
OA/Box Number: 530000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/01/2000 - 11/27/2000]

Adam Bergfeld
2006-0226-F
ab632

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

U.S. EMBASSY TRANSFER TAKES PLACE, IT WOULD BE INTERPRETED AS U.S. SUPPORT FOR THE ISRAELI OCCUPATION.

4. (U) THE WRITER STATES THAT ISSUANCE OF SUCH "THREATS" DOES NOT SERVE THE PEACE PROCESS NOR DOES IT ASSIST IN CREATING A HEALTHY ATMOSPHERE BETWEEN THE ISRAELIS AND THE PALESTINIANS. INSTEAD, IT CASTS DOUBTS ON THE CREDIBILITY OF THE U.S. AS A GENUINELY NEUTRAL SPONSOR. THE EDITORIAL SPECULATES THAT PRESIDENT CLINTON WAS DISAPPOINTED BY THE FAILURE OF THE CAMP DAVID SUMMIT, NOT ONLY BECAUSE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST WAS NOT ACHIEVED, BUT, MORE IMPORTANTLY, BECAUSE HE HAD HOPED SIGNING A PEACE ACCORD WOULD BOLSTER THE POPULARITY OF DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL HOPEFUL, VICE PRESIDENT GORE.

5. (U) WHILE THE WRITER QUOTES CHIEF PALESTINIAN NEGOTIATOR, SAEB IRIKAT, AS SAYING THAT "ABOUT 80 PERCENT" OF THE WORK HAD BEEN ACHIEVED, IT NONETHELESS CONCLUDES THAT "IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE PEACE AT THE EXPENSE OF THE INDISPUTABLE RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIANS." HE STRESSED THAT EAST JERUSALEM IS "OCCUPIED TERRITORY WHICH SHOULD BE RETURNED TO ITS OWNERS, IF A JUST PEACE IS TO BE ACHIEVED IN THE REGION."

6. (SBU) COMMENT: THERE IS LITTLE NEW IN THIS ARTICLE, EXCEPT PERHAPS THE LACK OF VITRIOL AND A RELATIVELY LOW-KEY ANALYSIS. THE IMPORTANCE HERE IS THE SPIN -- THE OMANIS ARE NOT HAPPY WITH THE PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS ON THE POSSIBLE EMBASSY MOVE TO JERUSALEM, BUT NEITHER ARE THEY UP IN ARMS.

GRAPPO

TOR: 07/30/00 08:38:14

DIST: SIT: BABBITT BANBURY BOLAN NSC FELDMAN MALLEY MCLEAN NAPLAN PATTEN
Pollack RIEDEL SCHWARTZ SMITHP WILCOX

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
011. email	Richard M. Sanders to Mathew N. Gobush, Michael H. Orfini, and Tyler S. Beardsley at 11:31:59. Subject: Leon, Elian and Eliane. (2 pages)	03/31/2000	P5
012. email	Mathew N. Gobush to Michael H. Orfini at 4:12:55. Subject: U'wa Guidance. (4 pages)	04/19/2000	P5
013. email	Ralph H. Sigler to Robin S. Rickard at 10:55:11 AM. Subject: Blair-Gore notes. (7 pages)	04/22/2000	P1/b(1)
014. email	Robin S. Rickard to Leslie K. Davidson, Steedman Hinkley, and Todd H. Dennett at 11:18:22 AM. Subject: VP-Blair notes, 22 April 2000. (14 pages)	04/22/2000	P1/b(1)
015. email	Steedman Hinkley to Andrew S. Weiss at 9:31:13 AM. Subject: FW: VP-Blair notes, 22 April 2000. (14 pages)	04/24/2000	P1/b(1)
016. email	Leslie K. Davidson to Anthony J. Blinken, Richard B. Norland, and Hoyt B. Yee at 10:42:11. Subject: FW: VP-Blair notes, 22 April 2000. (14 pages)	04/24/2000	P1/b(1)
017. email	Natalie S. Wosniak to Brook D. Anderson, Katherine A. Brown, et.al. at 5:53:20. Subject: FW: John Lancaster, Washington Post. (2 pages)	05/31/2000	P5
018. email	Philip J. crowley to Natalie S. Wozniak, Brooke D. Anderson, et.al. at 7:59:41. Subject: RE: John Lancaster, Washington Post. (3 pages)	05/31/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Gore and Campaign])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/26/2000 - 05/31/2000]

Adam Bergfeld
2006-0226-F
ab633

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

W.I.C. LIBRARY COPY

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/19/2000 4:12:55 PM
FROM Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT U'wa Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Orfini, Michael H. (VP)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Mike - Can you please update this guidance? An answer to the catch all question "What has the Vice President done to resolve this issue?" should cover most of our needs. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Uwa PG 4-19-00.doc
Guidance on U'wa
January 24, 2000

Background: In late September of 1999, Occidental Petroleum won approval to begin drilling for oil in the so-called Samore block of the northeastern Colombian Amazon region after a seven-year legal dispute over indigenous rights.

The U'wa are adamantly opposed to the drilling and warn that the project will lead to an increase in violence as seen in other oil regions of Colombia. This dispute included threats of mass suicide from the U'wa indian community in the area. In August, as part of a concession to the tribe, the Colombian government enlarged the area of the official U'wa reserve from 40,000 hectares to 543,000 hectares. In November, some 200 U'wa indians occupied the test drill site, which lies just outside the government-recognized Indian reservation, but still within an area that the U'wa claim as traditional tribal homeland. Recently, the Colombian military have entered the area to secure the site.

Groups like the Sierra Club, Rainforest Action Network and Amazon Watch have campaigned actively on this issue for several years and disrupted a

recent
Occidental shareholder meeting to voice opposition to proceeding
with the
project. Now, they are turning their guns on the Vice President,
essentially
alleging that the Vice President - because he is "inextricably linked" to

Occidental - is willing to sell out the environmental and indigenous
rights
threatened by Oxy, in order to advance his financial and political
ambitions.

Activists have already begun protesting at some Gore events, and
Financial Times.
Com and Salon Magazine have both run recent pieces articulating the
NGO view on
this.

What is the Vice President's opinion of Occidental's efforts to drill in
the
traditional territory of the U'wa Indians, in spite of the damage to the
environment and indigenous rights, and the oil-related violence it
would trigger?

The Vice President is a longtime advocate of rainforest conservation,
indigenous
rights, and careful consideration of environmental impact of natural
resource
development - in the United States and abroad.

While he has not been involved in the discussions between the U'wa
Tribe, the
Government of Colombia and Occidental Petroleum, he hopes all
sides in Colombia
continue to address questions of the environment and indigenous
rights and try to
settle them to the satisfaction of all parties.

But these issues have not been addressed, and Oxy is preparing to
begin drilling
its exploratory well.

The Vice President has not been involved in discussions on this issue,
so he
doesn't know the particulars. But Administration and White House
officials are
reaching out to groups concerned about this to gather more
information.

What about the charges that the Vice President is selling out his interests in the environment and indigenous rights because he is too closely tied to Occidental?

In October, the Vice President announced that if he is elected President, he will take the most sweeping steps in history to protect our oceans and coastal waters from offshore drilling. This means a blanket prohibition on any new oil leasing off the coasts of California and Florida. It also means working to fight any new drilling off both Florida and California, even in areas already leased for drilling.

This clearly elevates environmental interests over oil interests, including Occidental's. And that explodes the myth that he somehow takes special care of Occidental to advance his personal financial or political interests.

Well, why doesn't the Vice President call Occidental and tell them to end this project?

As I said, the Vice President has not been involved in discussions on this issue. It would be premature to demand action without knowing all the particulars.

Will the Vice President call on Occidental to suspend plans for drilling until he has a chance to review the situation?

His first step has to be to learn more about the situation.

Will the Vice President sell his Occidental stock?

As I said, the Vice President's first step has to be to learn more about the situation.

